

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****MAY 17 2007****REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his thoughtful review of the present application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- a. **Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 12-13, 16-18, 20-27 and 30-33 are Pending in the present application.**
- b. **Claims 1, 16, 17, 23, 30 and 32 have been amended in the present application.**
- c. **Claims 9, 14 and 20 have been canceled.**
- d. **Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 12-13, 16-18, 20-27 and 30-33 remain rejected.**

No new matter has been introduced with the amendment of this application.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 17 2007

i. ARGUMENTa. Drawing Objections

The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: Fig. 2, 210, 220, 230. Applicant herein asserts that the Examiner's referenced Fig. 2 was never entered into the instant application and the related objection is not applicable and should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Specifically, the Office Action stated that all of the limitations of claims 2-16, 18, and 20-33 must be shown or the feature(s) cancelled from the claims(s). Applicants submit that no further drawings or drawing amendments are required in the present application.

For example, with respect to the method claims 2-13, 18-28, and 30-31, the steps recited therein are further definitions of the steps already shown in the flow chart of Figure 1. Thus, these steps are shown in the drawings. The specific description of these steps is also fully supported by the specification.

With respect to claims 16, 29, 32 and 33, these claims are directed to an embodiment of the invention directed to a system with components that implement the steps of Figure 1, as these steps are further defined. The specific description of these implemented steps is also fully supported by the specification.

Moreover, applicants note that 35 U.S.C. 113 requires a drawing only "where necessary for the understanding of the subject matter to be patented." In the present case, an understanding of the subject matter to be patented, as embodied in the claims, is clear from Figure 1 in its current form along with the specification. Thus, no further drawings, or drawing amendments are required.

Still further, applicants submit that there is no requirement that the exact wording of the claims be reproduced in the figures, as long as the invention as claimed can be understood from the disclosure. It is well known in U.S. patent practice, such as in the chemical arts for example, that many claimed inventions require no drawings whatsoever. In the present case, no further drawing or drawing amendments are required to understand the invention. To require that "all of the limitations" of claims 2-

16, 18, and 20-33 be expressly shown in detail in the drawing would amount to an unnecessary and burdensome requirement that much of the text of the specification be transposed to the drawings. Such an amendment is not necessary for the present application, where the claims can be well understood without.

For at least the above reasons, applicants request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

b. Rejection of Claims 1-6, 16, 17 and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) (102 Reference)

The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent Claims 1, 16 and 23 as being anticipated by US Patent 5,745,102 to *Bloch* and herein asserts that independent Claims 1, 16, 17 and 23 have been amended respectively to include the allowable subject matter of Claims 9 and 20. Accordingly the rejection of independent Claims 1, 16 and 23 as being anticipated by US Patent 5,745,102 to *Bloch* under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-6 and 24-25 depend from independent Claims 1 and 23 respectively and inherit all of their limitations. Therefore, Claims 2-6 and 24-25 are also patentably distinct in view of *Bloch* and the rejections of Claims 2-6 and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) ought to now be withdrawn.

c. Rejection of Claims 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) (847 Reference)

The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent Claims 30 and 32 as being anticipated by US Patent 5,933,847 to *Ogawa* and herein asserts that independent Claims 30 and 32 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of Claim 20. Accordingly the rejection of independent Claims 30 and 32 as being anticipated by US Patent 5,933,847 to *Ogawa* under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be withdrawn.

Claims 31 and 33 depend from independent Claims 30 and 32 respectively and inherit all of their limitations. Therefore, Claims 31 and 33 are also patentably distinct in

view of *Ogawa* and the rejections of Claims 31 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) ought to now be withdrawn.

d. Rejection of Claims 8 and 13 as unpatenable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) (006, 102 References)

Claims 8 and 13 depend from independent Claim 1 and inherit all of its limitations. Therefore, Claims 8 and 13 are patentably distinct in view of the *Bruce/Bloch* combination of references and the rejection of Claims 8 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) ought to now be withdrawn.

e. Rejection of Claim 12 as unpatenable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) (102 Reference)

Claim 12 depends from independent Claim 1 and inherit all of its limitations. Therefore, Claim 12 is patentably distinct in view of the *Bloch* reference and the rejection of Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) ought to now be withdrawn.

f. Rejection of Claim 18 as unpatenable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) (102, 689 References)

Claim 18 depends from independent Claim 17 and inherit all of its limitations. Therefore, Claim 18 is patentably distinct in view of the *Bloch/Bueno* combination of references and the rejection of Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) ought to now be withdrawn.

g. Rejection of Claim 26 as unpatenable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) (102, 006 References)

Claim 26 depends from Independent Claim 23 and inherit all of its limitations. Therefore, Claim 26 is patentably distinct in view of the *Bloch/Ogawa* combination of references and the rejection of Claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) ought to now be withdrawn.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 17 2007


h. Rejection of Claim 27 as unpatenable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) (102,
113 References)

Claim 27 depends from independent Claim 23 and inherit all of it's limitations. Therefore, Claim 27 is patentably distinct in view of the *Bloch/Tsuboi* combination of references and the rejection of Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) ought to now be withdrawn.

ii. CONCLUSION

Applicant now believes the present case to be in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,



Wendell J. Jones
Reg. No. 45,961